REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed March 19, 2008. Claims 1, 6, 7, and 19-22 were pending in the present application. This Amendment amends claims 1, 19, and 22, and adds new claims 23-25, leaving pending in the application claims 1, 6, 7, and 19-25. Applicants submit that no new matter has been introduced by virtue of these amendments. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection of Claims 1, 6, 7, and 19-22

Claims 1, 6, 7, and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Decasper et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2007/0192474, hereinafter "Decasper"). Applicants respectfully submit that Decasper does not disclose each and every feature of these claims.

Embodiments of the present invention are directed to techniques for sharing information in a peer-to-peer (P2P) network. According to one set of embodiments, a P2P network comprises a management server (*e.g.*, server 72 of Specification, FIG. 7) and a plurality of peer client systems (*e.g.*, systems 82a, 82b of Specification, FIG. 7). Each peer client system may store a collection of information (*i.e.*, an "information source"). Further, each peer client system may subscribe to an information source stored in another peer client system. (Specification: para. 7). For example, as shown in FIG. 7 of the Specification, peer client system 82a is subscribed to information source 32 stored in peer client system 82b.

If an information source is modified, the peer client system storing the information source receives, from the management server, a list of all peer client systems subscribed to the information source. (Specification: para. 41). The peer client system then transmits an alert message <u>directly</u> to each of the peer client systems subscribed to the information source, thereby notifying those peer client systems that the information source has been modified. (Specification: para. 42; FIG. 7). Returning to the example of FIG. 7, if information source 32 is modified, peer client system 82b receives, from management server 72, a list of peer client systems subscribed to information source 32 (*e.g.*, peer client system 82a).

Appl. No. 10/680,701
Amdt. dated June 13, 2008
Reply to Final Office Action dated March 19, 2008

PATENT

Peer client system 82b then sends an alert message <u>directly</u> to peer client system 82a indicating that information source 32 has been modified. Since the alert message is sent directly between peer client systems 82b and 82a, rather than through management server 72, the load on management server 72 is reduced and effective load balancing across the P2P network may be achieved.

In accordance with the above, Applicants' independent claim 1 (as amended) recites:

> A method for accessing information in a peer to peer network, the method comprising:...
>
> detecting, in the first server system, a modification to an information source, the step of detecting comprising receiving, from a first peer client system, an indication that a first information source has been modified, and if the first server system determines that there is a first subscription that is associated with the first information source, communicating to the first peer client system a list of second peer client systems that are associated with the first subscription,
>
> wherein the first peer client system communicates an alert message to each second peer client system directly,...
>
> (Applicants' independent claim 1, in part, as amended).

At least the above features are not disclosed by Decasper.

Decasper is directed to a system comprising a plurality of clients (*e.g.*, clients 503.1, 503.2 of Decasper, FIG. 5) and a "master controller" (*e.g.*, controller 501 of Decasper, FIG. 5). According to one embodiment, the master controller of Decasper determines whether new content objects are stored in a first client in the plurality of clients. If new content objects are stored in the first client, the master controller sends a message to one or more other clients to initiate a download of the new content objects from the first client. (Decasper: para. 41). According to another embodiment, the master controller of Decasper receives, from a first client seeking to download content, a request for new content objects that are stored in other clients. The master controller then sends a list of the new content objects (and the clients they are stored in) to the first client. (Decasper: para. 42).

Applicants submit that the invention of Decasper is substantially different from Applicants' amended claim 1. For example, Decasper fails to disclose "wherein the first peer

client system communicates an alert message to each second peer client system <u>directly</u>" as recited in amended claim 1. (Emphasis added).

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Decasper discloses a first peer client system communicating an alert message to a second peer client system because "a first peer client communicates an alert message to a master controller that it has received new content and the master controller alerts a second peer client system of the new content." (Office Action: pg. 5). In other words, the Examiner asserts that Decasper teaches communicating an alert message from a first peer client system to a second peer client system <u>through a master controller</u>. The Examiner goes on to state that "it is not clearly claimed [in claim 1] that the alert message can not be relayed through a master controller." (Office Action: pg. 5). However, claim 1 has now been amended to specifically recite that a first peer client system communicates an alert message to a second peer client system <u>directly</u> (*i.e.*, without going through any other system/controller). Since Decasper merely teaches communicating an alert message from a first peer client system to a second peer client system <u>through a master controller</u> (as asserted by the Examiner) rather than <u>directly</u>, Decasper necessarily fails to disclose "wherein the first peer client system communicates an alert message to each second peer client system <u>directly</u>" as recited in amended claim 1. (Emphasis added).

Further, Applicants submit that Decasper fails to disclose "receiving, from a first peer client system, an indication that a first information source has been modified, and if the first server system determines that there is a first subscription that is associated with the first information source, communicating to the first peer client system a list of second peer client systems that are associated with the first subscription" as recited in amended claim 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that these features are shown in Decasper because

> Decasper discloses detecting a modification to an information source because master controller gets updated with new content objects (see paragraph 49). Decasper also discloses communicating to a first peer client system a list of second client systems (see paragraph 49, showing that clients can receive from the master controller a list of new objects that are available as well as their locations (e.g., content servers, peer clients (i.e., second client systems), or peer client appliances) that are subscribed to an information source (see paragraph 72, showing

> how a client can subscribe to a master controller to get notification of new content and paragraph
>
> 31, showing subscription to new content base on information in a user profile.

<div align="center">(Office Action: pg. 6).</div>

Applicants respectfully disagree.

As best understood, the Examiner construes the claimed feature of "receiving, from a first peer client system, an indication that a first information source has been modified" as corresponding to receiving, from a first client, an indication that new content objects are available on the first client in Decasper. Further, the Examiner construes the claimed feature of "communicating to the first peer client system a list of second peer client systems that are associated with the first subscription" as corresponding to receiving, at the first client, a list of new content objects (and a list of second clients storing those new content objects) in Decasper. However, claim 1 specifically recites that the list of second peer client systems sent to the first peer client system are associated with a first subscription, and the first subscription is associated with the first information source. This logical relationship is not shown in Decasper. For example, returning to the Examiner's construction of claim 1, nowhere does Decasper disclose, or even suggest, that the second clients included in the list of new content objects sent to the first client (*i.e.*, the claimed "second peer client systems") are associated with a subscription which is, in turn, associated with information stored in the first client (*i.e.*, the claimed "first information source"). In fact, Decasper indicates the exact opposite – that is, Decasper indicates the first client is subscribed to information stored in the second clients (rather than the second clients being subscribed to information stored in the first client), and is therefore receiving a list of new content objects to download from the second clients. Accordingly, Decasper necessarily fails to disclose "receiving, from a first peer client system, an indication that a first information source has been modified, and if the first server system determines that there is a first subscription that is associated with the first information source, communicating to the first peer client system a list of second peer client systems that are associated with the first subscription" as recited in amended claim 1. (Emphasis added).

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that Decasper does not anticipate or render obvious Applicants' independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claims 19 and 22 have been amended to recite features that are substantially similar to independent claim 1, and are thus believed to be allowable over Decasper for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 1, and others.

Dependent claims 6, 7, 20, and 21 depend from independent claims 1 and 19 respectively, and are thus believed to be allowable over Decasper for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claims 1 and 19, and others.

New Claims 23-25

New claims 23-25 have been added to cover various aspects of the present invention. Support for the new claims may be found in the Specification at, for example, paragraph 42.

Claims 23-25 depend from independent claims 1, 19, and 22 respectively, which are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Decasper as discussed above. Accordingly, claims 23-25 are believed to be allowable over Decasper for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claims 1, 19, and 22, and others.

Amendments to the Claims

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the Specification as filed and do not add new matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Andrew J. Lee/

Andrew J. Lee
Reg. No. 60,371

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
AJL:tmm:mg
61340375 v1